

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8591
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, April 28, 2015

8:30 AM

Planning Division

50 W. Gay Street, (Beacon Building) Conference Room B – 1st Floor

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair), Otto Beatty Jr., Michael Brown, , Kyle Katz, Robert Loversidge, Mike Lusk, Jana Maniace

Absent: Tedd Hardesy, Danni Palmore

City Staff Present: Daniel Thomas, Elizabeth Brown, Dan Blechschmidt, Dave Bush, Barry Bryant

II. Approval of the March 24, 2015 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve, with special note of Vice Chair Beatty's efficacy at prior meeting (7-0)

III. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #1 15-4-1

Addresses: 111 N. Front St. (Office), 135 & 141 N. Front St. (Garage)

Applicant: Robert D. Loversidge Jr. FAIA – Schooley Caldwell Associates

Property Owner: City of Columbus

Design Professional : Schooley Caldwell Associates / Design Group

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a new City of Columbus Office building and a new City of Columbus parking garage CC3359.05(C).

The building was conceptually reviewed in November 2014 and the garage was conceptually reviewed in February 2015. Refer to case brief notes.

Discussion

Robert Loversidge – presented conceptually a few months ago. Motif sketch shown – the relationship between this new building and City Hall. Brian Kinzelman showed the greenspace / campus plan. Materials and finishes. RL – went over the floor plan – the consolidation of City One-Stop-Shop functions. The parking structure, holding 700 vehicles is across Long Street. The area is looked upon as the City Hall campus, a unified whole. BK – went over plantings and materials of green area. The rain garden was described. Planting were selected on the basis of urban tolerances.

JM – question about low planters in front of Police Division. BK – there will be a modest water feature to add some white noise. Lighting was pointed out. There will basically be (at this time) no restrictions on pets. KK – questions about public art. – RL – there will be a public art program, both inside and out. Building appearance and materials was (shown and) discussed. Mike Bongorno - The zinc will stay largely as is. Some of the materials (granite) are reflective of City Hall. Sun shades will symbolize departmental functions. The 8th floor will have a special “show off the city” conference room. Sam Rosenthal presented the interior. RL - The elevator lobby will have a direct view onto the green.

RL - Garage was discussed. A drop off area in front of the building is planned. The garage of 700 spaces will accommodate some oversized vehicles, clients (about 100), City vehicles and City employees. It will also accommodate some Bureau of Workman’s Compensation vehicles (part of the deal of purchasing the site). A voucher system will likely be used for visitors. Materials were discussed and presented. There will some ground floor, non-vehicular space, possibly a bike hub. MB – At night the gauze-like surface could be illuminated. The applicant anticipates coming back for graphics. No murals are anticipated. The garage should be subservient to the City Office building. OB – directional signage is important. SR – some form of way finding will be done. MB – architecturally exposed concrete (especially smooth) will be used at strategic places such as the stair well. Visibility and level of security for the garage will be emphasized. The will be stations for electric cars.

JM – concerns about west façade. RL – same type of material. SR – service doors are recessed. BK – the materials and treatment in front of 77 N. Front will continue on the back side of 111 N. Front. MB – Accessibility to roof garden. RL – it’s very sculptural and meant to be looked at. KK – motion to approve. OB – 2nd. ML – is there a truck dock. There will be a sharing facility with the Police Building and Ludlow will be used. Start is anticipated by late August.

Result

Motion to approve (6-0-1) Loversidge recusing

Case #2 15-4-2

Address: 330 E. Oak Street.

Applicant: G Andy Patterson, BIRI Capital Improvements Projects

Property Owner: Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane Inc.

Attorney: Erik Barbone

Design Professional: Jonathan Barnes

Request CC3359.07A

Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new 7-story apartment with two levels of underground parking. Requires the demolition of the existing 330 E. Oak St.

The Downtown Commission has heard case concerning 330 Oak Street three times. It first heard this case on September 23, 2014. The Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to turn down the request for demolition. The request for demolition was brought back up on December 16, 2014 and this time it was tabled. Refer to Results from last month’s meeting where schematic plans for a replacement was presented

Discussion

SW – Request today is for a CoA for the construction of a new building and a demolition of the existing building. Greg Lustini (Bricker & Eckler) representing BIRI, the building owners. BIRI's main goal is a CoA for demolition of the existing building. Need to be on the right timeline for both demo and the new building. Contract for purchase is in final state of approval. Would like to look thru it before distribution. Could show evidence of the contract thru staff.

Jonathan Barnes, history of existing building and site context. Plans for a replacement building. Capital Street treatment – Capitol Law School Master Plan. Pedestrian entrance on Capital. Seven story residential with structured parking, and an amenities space. Autos will enter the garage off of Oak Street. Currently 104 apartments and 104 underground parking spaces are planned. Market – Capital Law, other students nearby hospitals. Simple plan, double loaded corridor. Lobby off of Capital Street. Primary exterior materials are metal panels (red). Exuberant building at this location makes sense. Panels vary. There are railings, balconies, and louvers. SW – tell us about the ground floor. JB – the first floor will be a combination of parking (sloping down from Oak Street) on the west and apartments on the east. There will be units on the first floor facing the public alley. There will be raised balconies (so to speak). The garage will be underneath, on top of which will be a slightly raised plinth. SW / RL what will the roof be comprised of? JB – roofing of some sort. It's an alley that is easy to miss. JM- defining materials and colors. SW – I like the red, predominately as an accent color. The concrete color will make the red pop. KK – what will the red look like in 20 years? JB – it is a long term product. KK – How will the building be identified, is there any kind of signage? JB we will have to follow up on signage and lighting, which is typical. KK – what about murals? I'm usually an opponent, such as when the soccer ball was proposed for the Brunson Building. I've softened since then. SW – not many places where a mural can go on the building. ML – is there a landscape opportunity on the raised plinth. JM – on the north elevation, you are dealing with stair and elevator. Could something (address?) be done that is oversized and creative? The north side looks a little more add on as opposed to the south. Have you thought about varying the units? JB – start with typical unit but could expand.

RL – struggling a bit with the very expensive underground parking and the small residential units. How does the economics work? JB – we do a lot of units this way, it's often more a question of quality of finish. The look of the building will primarily stay the same if the number of units are reduced. ML – this is for demolition and approval of new building. Will we hear from the developer about his plans for putting this project together? SW – we can approve demolition but they have to verify that they can proceed. – financing commitment. KK – permit for construction? SW – I think that they have to show that they have the financing in place. OB – there is a letter from the bank in here. KK – I see a replacement project that allows for demolition to take place. That's the big question. How do we finalize and make certain this takes place before demolition takes place? That's the way it works for all cases. SW - We can approve the building today and the demolition subject to verification that the new building will be built. JB – subject to verification that the building will be built – what does that entail? SW – a firm financial commitment.

Mo Dioun, Stonehenge Company. Developing in Central Ohio for 28 years and do not own a single parking lot in downtown or anywhere else. Intention is to build a one of a kind, unique building that will replace this relatively historical, but highly contaminated building. Stonehenge did first approach BIRI about purchasing the existing building but BIRI was adamant about taking the building down. So far we have spent an enormous amount of resources, A & E and legal. We have a firm purchase agreement. There is no way we can get an absolute, firm financial commitment until the time when you have your permit secure, you have your contract and builders in place until the time you go to the closing table and you get your loan. We have a letter from a bank and a marketing study. We believe there is a need for work force housing in downtown – for less than \$2 per sf. As for cost of parking - we are taking over after the excavation is done. A lot of savings by doing this. Rental (\$1,100, \$1,200) would have to absorb the cost of the parking – there is as market for this. I don't know what else I can do. Introduction of Carol Smith, SNT Bank, has supported Mo over the last 20 years. Her bank and two others are interested.

RL - Who is the applicant? GL – right now, BIRI is because they are taking down the building. RL – but they aren't going to build the building. GL – we could amend the application so that Stonehenge is the co-applicant. SW – what we are being asked to do is to approve this project. RL - open hole and construction, how can we tie the two together? I'm not willing to approve the demolition unless I know the building is going to happen. I believe this is going to happen, but I need to know how we can tie these two things together. We've been burned in the past. SW – I think we approve the building – the replacement use, then we approve the demolition subject to having evidence of financing and evidence that they are going to move forward. This is what we've done in the past.

MB – that will give them certificates. SW – all they have to do is bring in the evidence. We could do this as two separate motions. RL – needs to be tied together. GL – the building is not a simple knock down, the process is longer, which makes this more challenging. How do we agree on how we leave a hole and hand it off at the right time. It's going to take BIRI / Turner a while to take the building down. How does this affect final financing? What level of proof do you need to have. We could get a conditional approval on the CoA to demolish, and then come back with some form of financial proof. SW – I don't understand what the problem is, financing is done all of the time.

SW – I'm not certain we have a problem with the building. MD – Do you have a sample of how this proof was done in the past? We have already spent .5 million in A & E. The real proof is done at the closing. SW – every financing commitment is obviously subject to a set of financing commitments. We're not going to provide examples. KK – I think there is momentum towards getting this done. I don't think you'll have trouble getting it financed or done. The issue is that there are some unknowns – something could come up during remediation. Our concern is to have something demolished and then have nothing take place. MD – we will not know that until the time demolition is done. RL – how we construct a motion that ties demolition to construction? GL – we have fulfilled code and guideline requirement for a replacement use. We are trying to get financing commitment – a letter from the bank, getting a market study, and to get demolition so that we can have a hand off.

The Commission should approve new building and demolition at the same time. What does that financial proof look like? OB – I don't want to assume that some entities can get financing and some cannot.

Contract introduced but not distributed. Bank officer present but did not talk.

OB – talked about one line in market study that he would advise be deleted. Tenor of letter. MD at this stage, we cannot have all of that information (still relatively schematic). Difficult to come up with finite numbers that the bank can work with. Carol Smith (banker) present, has indicated support. Two other banks have indicated interested interest in financing. OB – I'm on your side, I'm looking for a way to move forward. GL – what sort of things are needed from a bank.? MB – applicant can request examples of what the Commission has asked for in the past. About time to make a motion to say whether or not we are ready to go on this. It's been 7 months. We have a decent proposal, it's great progress. Caveats are for a demo, and building, evidence that the property is being sold, a more detailed letter from the bank showing better evidencing of the finance. We're more hung up on this as opposed to the actual project. SW – two motions or one?

RL, KK & MB – I'd like to make one motion so that the demolition is tied to the new building. (What he MB said just earlier) I'd like to make a motion that 330 E. Oak Street for the purpose of the erection of the new 7 story (residential) apartment and parking designed by Jonathan Barnes subject to evidence of the financing of the project moving forward

JM – need for a site plan, including landscaping. “Developing” the lower portion. (Main entrance area. Right color mullions so we can understand it better. And that the Commission can have a comfort level that some of these things will happen) SW –you need to be more specific about the direction for demolition as it relates to financing. RL – for the approval for the demolition of 330 E. Oak Street, for the purposes of the construction of a 7-story apartment building and parking garage as submitted subject to evidence that the property has changed hands, evidence from a financial institution that financing will be available, return for approval of lighting, signage, site plan and details of the exposed plinth, and of the design of the parking entry (they would have to do this anyway) KK – 2nd

OB - Does that get you what you need. MD – We can get you what the process and industry standards. OB – we're just trying to be reasonable about how to get this done. We've been dealing with this for months and you've come up with a good plan. MD - We've already invested a lot of time and money. SW – I think that things are too wide open.

Result

Motion to approve the demolition of the existing 330 E. Oak Street and the erection of a seven story apartment building and two levels of underground parking subject to

- Evidence that the property has changed hands
- Evidence from a financial institution that financing will be available
- A return for approval of lighting, signage, site plan and details of the exposed plinth, and of the design of the parking entry.

6-1 (Wittmann)

Case #3 15-4-3**Address:** 262 Neil Avenue**The Eye Center****Applicant:** Rick Heiple

Columbus Sign Company

Property Owner: Eye Center Realty Partners**Request** CC3359.07A

Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of a sign above the second floor and the installation of a slightly larger new sign above the fifth floor.

Discussion

This is on the south elevation. A building will go up in front of it at which time the new sign will become more or less obsolete. A higher and bigger sign is requested by the Eye Center, having their clients locate the building is important. KK – move to accept.

Result

Motion to approve. (7-0)

Case #4 15-4-4**Address:** 41 S. High Street**Huntington Center****Applicant:** Hines**Property Owner:** Huntington Center Owner LLC**Design Professional:** Design Collective**Request** CC3359.07D

Certificate of Appropriateness for a monument sign for major tenants of the Huntington Center. The sign will be out of the public R.O.W.

Discussion

Single monument sign has been proposed, although the applicant has brought a counter proposal for two smaller signs. This was handed out. The material of the sign is designed to match the planters which were installed in 2006. White glass. A monument sign was removed in 2006. The sign(s) would be illuminated at night (LED or solar option). Tenants want their logo, custom font and color.

SW - Which of the two do you prefer? A – The dual option is preferred. RL – How does it work with the white glass? A. – High quality vinyl. RL – if back lit, wouldn't it not appear at night? ML – Four surfaces front and back? A. The lower panel allows for more tenants, albeit a little less prominent. SW – I don't really have a problem with this but aren't you messing with a massive, elegant building? It's a little busy. A – we want to do this in a coherent manner. KK – motion to accept either proposal. Check the lighting.

Result

Move to approve. (7-0)

Case #5 15-4-5

Address: 111 W. Nationwide Blvd.

Sonoma Grill

Applicant: Pamela Lowery

Property Owner: Putnam Hill Company Limited Partnership (Yenkin / Majestic)

Design Professional: Capital City Awning

Request CC3359.07A

Certificate of Appropriateness for the two awnings and graphics on the awnings. One awning covers a good portion of the outdoor seating area for the grill, and the other awning accents a small window on Nationwide Boulevard.

Discussion

There is an issue with having simple signage, particularly in getting open. SW – sometime less is more. ML – do you plan to be able to close this up during cold weather? A - Yes

Result

Motion to approve (6-0-1) Loversidge abstaining

IV. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Mural

Case #6 15-4-6M

Columbus Zoo ad mural

106 N. High Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: 106 North High Street LLC (The Atrium Lofts)

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation at 106 N. High Street. Proposed mural – Columbus Zoo – “Pirates for the planet. This Summer. ”. The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, the latest for Direct Energy. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 45’3”W x 90’6”H Two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from May 15 through July 15, 2015

Area of mural: 4,095 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 1.3%

Result

Move to approve (7-0)

Case #7 15-4-7M**Cirque du Soleil ad mural****265 Neil Avenue (Northbank Condos) – facing southbound Neil Ave. traffic****Applicant:** Orange Barrel Media**Property Owner:** NWD 300 Spring LLC**Request:**

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 265 Neil Avenue. Proposed mural – Cirque du Soleil – “Kooza . . .” The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, one of the latest being for The Creation Museum CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 70’W x 31’H Two dimensional, non lit**Term of installation:** Seeking approval from May 15 through June 15, 2015.**Area of mural:** 2,170 sf**Approximate % of area that is text:** a. all lettering (including Kooza) 14%
b. excluding Kooza 5%**Discussion**

MB - motion to approve if they reduce the text. Megan Knox – attempt was made as to what the logos were. Cirque du Soleil is a well-known company. Each show has a separate name and log too. A new proposal was distributed that reduced text sizes significantly. KK – this looks fine. RL – I move approval.

Result

Motion to approve (7-0)

Case #8 15-4-8M**First Watch ad mural****123 E. Spring Street****Applicant:** Outfront Media**Property Owner:** Spring Street LLC**Request:**

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 123 E. Spring St. Proposed mural is for First Watch. The Downtown Commission approved a Captain Morgan ad mural in February 2014. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 15’H x 35’W Two dimensional, non lit**Term of installation:** Seeking approval from May 11 through September 27, 2015.**Area of mural:** 525sf**Approximate % of area that is text:** 2.5%**Discussion**

KK – move to accept.

Result

Motion to approve (7-0).

V. Business / Discussion

Follow up

- Columbus Museum of Art
North Entrance Sculpture

The sculpture in the entrance area was talked about during original final approval. A permit will have to be sought for the sculpture's foundation. SW – this is more or less part of the sculpture garden. Formalize this – it is an art museum.

- Sixth Street Mews
Changes to garage locations

Public Services will not allow garages on Milton. Edwards has revise plans. Motion made for approval (7-0).

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last meeting (Jan. 27, 2015)

1. St. Paul AME Church – gutters
2. 360 S Third St. – United Way Banner
3. 175 S Third St. Sprint rooftop antenna
4. Main St. – Bonfire blade sign
5. 268 S Fourth St. – door – swings out
6. Columbus Commons – Earth Day tents
7. 175 McConnell – Verizon rooftop antennas – vetted by NRI
8. 155 N. Fifth St. – alley door
9. 33 W Spring St. – COTA graphics revision
10. Huntington Park - timer
11. 155 W Main St. – Waterford railings
12. 40 W. Gay St. – window graphics
13. 250 S. High St. – door placement
14. 403 E. Broad St. – Roofing – Egan Ryan
15. 78-80 E. Long St. – Apple iPhone
16. 35 W Spring St. - Apple iPhone
17. 15 W. Cherry St. Apple iPhone
18. 285 N. Front St. (rear) Apple iPhone
19. 43 W. Long St. Apple iPhone
20. 35 W Spring St. - Apple iPhone

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 645-8404.